9:1

ew Perspectives in

AITH AND FREEDOM

KULBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

MORAL STANDARDS AND LABOR POWER

THEMES FOR LABOR DAY
1958

FAITH FOR OUR FREEDOM

(An Interpretation)

With this new issue we bring a new cover with a new concept and NEW PERSPECTIVES IN FAITH AND FREEDOM. *The cover is meant to tell a story, an important story, its theme the Cross over the world. For Spiritual Mobilization is Christian in origin, orientation, and purpose—not narrowly, but in the most fundamental, most prophetic sense of the word. For us the Cross is the symbol of conscience, the sign that stands for both judgment and redemption.*

And yet, not just a conventional Cross. In the upright and the cross-bar are further symbols. The sturdy, wooden upright is the sign of stability, of eternal verities, of conserved and conserving principles—"The Old Rugged Cross" of enduring faith "towering o'er the wrecks of time." In the sweeping jet-stream of the cross-bar is the sign of the ancient and enduring made contemporary, acknowledging the new needs, challenges, and insights of the dawning space-age. We need both perspectives, the old and the new, the eternal and the temporal, the spiritual and the scientific, the fruits of faith and the flower of reason.

And this cross stands over America to judge and redeem. It is not rooted in America, for it has universal meanings, brooding also over the world, calling all nations to the upward look. Nevertheless, America is our concern, not narrowly or provincially, but as our home, the beloved land we live in, the hearth upon which we stoke or stifle the fires of justice and freedom. What happens here will determine whether, indeed, America is to be "the last, best hope of earth." What happens here, hence the hope of the world, rests upon a faith whose fruit is freedom under God.

FAITH AND FREEDOM is published by Spiritual Mobilization, a national nonprofit, nonpartisan, nonsectarian organization founded in 1935. James C. Ingebretsen, President. James W. Fifield, Jr., Chairman.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: sent without charge to those who ask for it. If you wish to pay for your subscription, a $5 contribution covers a little more than cost; a contribution over $5 pays for subscriptions for libraries, clergymen, students and those not able to pay for their subscriptions.

EXTRA COPIES: 25c each up to ten; 20c each over ten. Introductory copies will be sent free to those you suggest. Should you suggest one or more, we would appreciate a contribution to cover the cost of mailing.

GIFT SUBSCRIPTIONS: sent with an appropriate card telling the recipient of your thoughtfulness. Just send us the names and addresses with an appropriate contribution.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS: be sure to give your complete former address (print or type, please).

STAFF: The Rev. Edward W. Greenfield, Editor; C. C. Johnston, Business Manager; Ernest Maxwell, Artist.

Published from six to eight times a year, at Campbell House, P.O. Box 877, San Jacinto, California. Copyright 1958. All rights reserved.

Vol. IX., No. 1 1958-59

RSPECTIVE ON FAITH AND FREEDOM

JAMES C. INGEBRETSEN

President of Spiritual Mobilization

The Rev. Edward W. Greenfield, Editor

Our society faces many ve dangers, both from hin and without, stem- ng from our own mater- sm and inner weak- ses quite as much as m the aggressive in- national conspiracy ch challenges the ole Western tradition. ritual Mobilization, ough the pages of its rnal, *Faith and Freedom*, l otherwise, has sought apply to our economic l political problems the viction that eternal rities and principles, proclaimed by the under of Christianity and by the found- of the American Republic, must guide course of our institutions and govern- nt if these are to endure.

We are dedicated to the concept of a iety of free men living in spiritual mmunion with one another and produ- g the means of livelihood through vol- ary cooperation and competition under system of free markets, private pro- ty, and limited government. We con- ue to believe that freedom in all areas human life, despite the risks and hard- ps that inhere in freedom -- indeed, *ause* they inhere in freedom -- is a essary condition for realizing all er values, both material and spiritual. Only as free men can individuals whol- fulfill their destinies as children of l. No man and no society can be ught into the Kingdom of God by co- ion -- not even when labeled as "so- l welfare." It is this erroneous belief coercion labeled as "social welfare" that won the allegiance of devout and sin- cere religious leaders to what has been called the "Social Gospel." We re- peat the long-time thesis of all libertarianism, that the only religiously jus- tifiable use of force is to protect individuals from the exercise of coercion by other individuals or groups.

The Internal Danger

Today, this freedom principle is being violat- ed to a considerable extent by organized labor. Or- ganized labor unions, we feel, have largely ceased to be a means of protecting the rights and promoting the real interests of individuals or of the community; many have become the means of exploitation and oppression. And it is upon all of us, as consumers and citizens, that the burden of this exploitation is now coming to rest.

That is why, in this issue and several to follow, we are focusing our attention and concern upon the moral problems presented by the growth and abuse of or- ganized coercive power in the labor union movement. We see this as a primary in- ternal threat to our entire society, per- haps as the major medium through which collective regimentation will come in- creasingly to dominate the lives of all of us. The coercions of communism as such, known and labeled, are not to be feared more than the disguised adapta- tions which thrive under the moral sanc- tions and spiritual blindness of a genera- tion that either accepts or fails to discern and challenge them.

The Richberg Challenge

The time has come when we must awaken to what Mr. Donald Richberg describes in his new book as "a clear and present danger": (1)

"Americans are more out-of-date and ill-informed concerning the realities of the labor movement in the United States than they are in any other area of public interest. Fifty years ago, the picture of a labor union as a weak, idealistic organization of downtrodden workers struggling against an oppressive concentration of property power was often accurate. Any such picture of an established union today is not merely ridiculous; it is willfully or ignorantly untruthful ....

"Instead of being a movement of workers banded together for the protection and advancement of their legitimate interests in a free economy, the labor movement has now become a political movement with the objective of establishing a socialist labor government in control of the economic and social life of the nation ....

"It is natural that union propaganda still portrays the unions as weak, defensive organizations of helpless wage earners who are forced to wage a continuing struggle against the ever-threatening oppression of great aggregations of heartless capital. As a matter of fact, the unions are powerful, aggressive organizations that are engaged in a continuing warfare against the maintenance of a free competitive economy. Unless this civil warfare is stopped and peaceful competition is substituted for monopolistic coercion in labor relations, a socialized economy and a socialist labor government are inevitable. This, unhappily, is not a remote prospect but one that is rapidly developing."

Thus, with this Labor Day issue of *Faith and Freedom*, we initiate an effort in depth to put under the sharp light of moral and spiritual scrutiny the policies and practices which have produce this threat to our free institutions.

(1) Richberg, Donald R., LABOR UNION MONOPOLY, A Real and Present Danger, Forward, pp. V and VII, and p. 175, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1957. Paper-bound copies available at $1.00 from Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, Inc., 210 East 43rd St., New York 17, N.Y.

A New Approach

We have been led to undertake this ef fort by the responses to a questionnair carried in this journal some time ago and by ensuing correspondence and con versations with thoughtful friends acros the country, as well as by the ideas de veloped in our several conferences o "Leadership in Today's World" and "Wor in Today's World." These have provide the framework for the course which lie ahead and about which we will be writin in more detail in subsequent issues.

But we are not limiting ourselves t the labor problem alone. In the course time we expect to be as comprehensive a possible within the scope of our declare faith, "Faith For Our Freedom," which ap pears inside the front cover. Though w believe it necessary to come to grips wit the abuses of union power, we feel that among other things, it is also necessar to test business and other leadership t try to discover the failures which permit ted the union abuses to develop. W must try to formulate an application o moral standards which will lead to th sort of creative work relationships with in which such naked power as we no confront can neither gain nor keep foothold.

The New Editor

This is our new approach under the new editor, the Rev. Edward W. Green field, former pastor of the First Presby terian Church of Princeton, Indiana, wh has also had several years' experienc as a college teacher and a factory worke

Yet the new *Faith and Freedom* is no really new. The first issue of this maga zine was published in December, 1949 What was said then to the first editor William Johnson, is appropriately said now:

"We want to publish a magazine whic will interest some of the most influentia persons in America -- the ministers.

"We know that there are countless questions unanswered about individua liberty. Furthermore, we believe tha

any of the answers are to be found in e spiritual area; many hinge upon the swer to a sincere question: 'What is the ture and destiny of man?'

"We want a magazine which will serve e ministers who will shape the answers these questions, a magazine which will mulate them, a magazine which will allenge them, a magazine which will rn a place in their busy schedules.

"Remember, above all else, that free- m must be understood before it is won. member Lincoln's words: 'The world s never had a good definition of liberty, d the American people, just now, are uch in want of one.'"

e Unchanging Faith

So the basic philosophy that governs *ith and Freedom* remains as it has been. ie editor is new, and he will have his rn way of influencing the character and ality of the journal. The cover and for- at are changed, and, rather than be a tchall for a variety of subjects, in- uding narrations and dramatizations, e contents of each issue will be more in e form of essays exploring in depth a ngle theme. Our new editor believes at searching thought on crucial issues s its own drama for people who think -- ergymen as well as thought-leaders in all walks of life who are concerned to apply moral standards to social problems, who seek social action without socialism, open or hidden.

Under Editor Greenfield's leadership and against the background of convictions stated in his "Confession" in this issue, we believe *Faith and Freedom* will be more than ever dedicated to the Christian libertarian point of view. This view is based on profound faith in God, the Author of liberty, and in Jesus Christ, who promoted persuasion in place of coercion as the means for accomplishing positive good, and whose emphasis was always upon the primacy and dignity of the individual as the starting point for relationships of creative communion with one another and with God.

Spiritual Mobilization's credo remains unchanged: that man, being created as a child of God, has certain inalienable rights and attendant responsibilities; that these rights and responsibilities must not be coercively usurped; and that the conscience of the church and of the community must be informed and aroused against every oppressive force that denies these rights, and against every seductive voice that would relieve men of personal moral responsibility.

To Readers of "Faith and Freedom"

We are eager to send our journal to as many as are willing to give it thoughtful attention. If you feel that your minister, your colleagues or friends should be receiving it, you can help by sending names and addresses with a covering contribution to Spiritual Mobilization, P. O. Box 877, San Jacinto, California.

Your Comments Invited

With our next issue we wish to begin a column of constructive reader comments. You are invited to write us, saying what you think, for or against, helping to create a better journal. Within the limits of space, we want to present comments on both sides of controversial matters. Letters must represent responsibility of thought, and should be signed.

MORAL STANDARDS AND UNION POWER

With humility, yet with firm recognition that men cannot escape the responsibility of making moral decisions in daily life, Spiritual Mobilization submits below a series of moral criteria in application to what it believes to be real and present dangers in organized labor. The statement that follows, while prepared in its original form by us, is the product of consultation with clergymen, businessmen, and members of labor unions. Readers are urged to subject it to the most thoughtful scrutiny and give us the benefit of further insight, whether favorable or unfavorable. Each of the points presented here will be more fully developed in an article, the first of which appears in this issue, and the rest of which will appear in future issues, of FAITH AND FREEDOM.

THE EDITOR

The long-standing avowed purposes of labor unions to secure "justice" in what they regard as a "fairer distribution" of the wealth produced by business and industry have appealed to many people as morally and religiously praiseworthy. Especially religious leaders, with their natural sympathy for the "underdog," have been led to champion the hopes and aspirations of the working man as represented by labor organizations. During the early years of the laboring man's struggle for recognition of what he regarded as his rights, there at least appeared to be considerable warrant for this lending of moral sanction on the part of many religious leaders and ecclesiastical organizations.

Whatever the merits of the union movement in its earlier stages, and the legitimacy of ecclesiastical support when the movement was still in struggling infancy, the vast power now in its hands, together with the appalling amount of corruption exposed by the Senate's Investigating Committee, point very clearly to the need for a new evaluation of organized labor. Attempts have been made by various ecclesiastical bodies, in the face of the embarrassing exposures of corruption, to meet the new situation by condemning such corruption, but stopping at this point and calling attention to comparable sins on the part of management and others.

It is not to be questioned that violations of moral and legal standards are to be found elsewhere than in labor unions, but to point to the sins of others as an extenuation of the sins of organized labor is to evade the real issues. Management has been under moral review for generations; it is time to bring organized labor under moral review just as seriously and vigorously.

It is time to recognize that what we have now to deal with is not the simple and unquestionable right of workers to organize and bargain collectively, but what has many of the appearances of a conspiracy disguised by the legitimate claims and worthy purposes of laboring people. What seems to be developing is a use of the labor union movement by a number of irresponsible leaders in ways which, if unchallenged and uncorrected, can bring not only rank and file workingmen and their employers, but even our entire society under collectivistic control. It is this misuse of union power that has brought discredit upon and obscured and corrupted what is good and right in the organizations of labor.

Accordingly, the following criteria, ased upon unimpeachable standards de- ived from the Judeo-Christian tradition, re submitted for the thoughtful consid- ration of all who are concerned for jus- ce and freedom.

PERSUASION VS. COERCION AND VIOLENCE

Whereas the Christian principle has lways been persuasion by love, reason nd example rather than force, with the ossible (sometimes debated) exception f the emergency of self-defense, the nion movement must be judged first ac- ording to its *resort to coercion and vio- nce*. At this point the frequent use of orce by labor unions to secure their de- nands cannot fail to be noticed, though t must be further recognized that coer- ion is often hidden as an implicit threat, o be used only if considered "necessary." The strike weapon enjoys the sanction of oth law and current morality, not to peak of the moral approval of many re- gious leaders. Together with the "right o strike," however, organized labor also njoys the moral and legal immunities f a "double standard" which winks at iolence and intimidation when these rupt in times of strike. While the right o refuse to work, as an individual or an rganized group, is not seriously called nto question, the prevailing pattern of reventing others from working, fre- uently by the use of vilification, intimi- ation, and violence against those who ish to continue work, must be called nder the severest moral indictment. The se of violence in times of strike has too many resemblances to war.

II. VOLUNTARY VS. COMPULSORY UNION MEMBERSHIP

Whereas the Christian principle has always been that of voluntary association and brotherhood, and whereas this principle, under the Constitution of the United States, has imposed limits upon the coercive power of even the government, organized labor must be judged according to its *insistence upon compulsory membership*, which is no more than another case of coercion, applied specifically to workers. All the arguments in favor of compulsory membership must fall before the ultimate principle of freedom of choice. Only government, by the conditions of citizenship, has the prerogative of compulsory obedience to its laws. To permit or delegate this prerogative to a private organization is to undermine the sovereignity of the state and to deprive individuals of their God-given right to choose. Indeed, government itself must respect a high degree of freedom of choice lest it become tyrannical. Organized labor, insofar as it prevents the freedom of association, which inherently carries with it the freedom of non-association, must be subjected to the most serious of moral judgments.

III. EQUAL RIGHTS VS. POLITICAL PRIVILEGE

Whereas the Christian principle has always been concern for the rights and liberties of all, and whereas this principle has been incorporated into the American system of balanced powers to try to prevent domination of any one group or individual by another, the union labor movement must be judged ac-

"The extent to which criminal, corrupt, and disreputable elements have infiltrated and now dominate the labor movement in some areas is shocking to an alarming degree. The impositions on management and the public, and the exploitation of union members in some labor organizations by arrogant and dishonest labor officials, have reached proportions that violate all proper ethics and standards of common decency, defy law and order, and constitute a serious threat to free trade unionism and our free enterprise system. Unless these vicious practices are stopped, there is real danger ultimately of a racketeer, gangster-dominated economy in our country."

Senator John L. McClellan. See also the McClellan articles in THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, May 3 and 10, 1958

cording to its *deliberate effort to add to the already existing legal immunities and political privileges highly partial to its special cause.* For a quarter of a century organized labor has enjoyed legislation and court decisions aiding to disproportionate degree its position and power as over against industry and other segments of society. Seeing the advantage in governmental favoritism, labor leaders are currently engaged in extensive political activities, both to prevent limiting legislation and to secure a still more privileged position under law. While most certainly organized labor is entitled to its fair hearing before legislative bodies, its attempt to secure disproportionate power is augmented by the use of union funds, contributed in innumerable cases against the will of union members, for partisan political purposes. When businessmen and others have sought exploitive advantage gained by political action, moral and religious leadership has forthrightly and properly brought them under judgment. In having sought special political privilege at the expense of the community at large, and in continuing to seek it with funds provided by often unwilling members, in order to increase its power, organized labor also must be brought under moral judgment.

> "You will get nothing in. We will close you up first if you don't sign up. We don't want a vote, we want a contract. I control Philadelphia. The union controls the country."
>
> Bernard J. Marcus, organizing director, Teamsters Joint Council 53, reported in PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, December 20, 1956, by a manager of Quaker City Motor Parts Co.

IV. EQUAL LIBERTY VS. CONCENTRATED POWER

As a consequence of the privilege noted in the foregoing, and in the face of the same moral principle of equal rights and liberties for all, organized labor must also be judged according to its *concentration of power* The frequently voiced charge of "labor monopoly" finds ample substance in several industries (such as the automotive, construction, mining, transportation, steel, and even musi in which an individual worker has vir tually no opportunity for employmer unless he belongs to one or another c the monolithic unions concerned. Th industries themselves are virtually pow erless to resist union demands. Th extent to which the power of organize labor would be further concentrated i union membership became universall extended under present policy, philos ophy, and law, is no less than frightenin The power to paralyze our entire econ omy that resides, for example, in th Teamsters' Union alone is enough t suggest the possibility of a union-dom inated economy and government. Neithe Christian nor democratic concern ca view this growing concentration of pow er with equanimity.

The Fruits of The Tree

These first four considerations ar basic. Any attempt to bring responsibilit ty, justice, and freedom into the ranks c organized labor cannot hope to be fruitfu unless the evils brought under judgment a these four points are corrected. It i these that feed and are fed by the furthe evils which are detailed hereafter; it i these four which are capable of bein corrected by appropriate legislation o by the vigorous, honest, and fearless en forcement of laws already existing.

The remaining evils to be cited fo moral evaluation, however, are equall important. They may not be so amenabl to correction by law, except in specia instances; but once the applicable mora principles are understood and the ele ments of coercion, compulsory member ship, special privilege and monopoly ar removed, they are open to correction b conscience within the ranks of labor it self and in cooperation with both manage ment and the larger community. We pro ceed, therefore, to the fruits of the fore going evils.

V. VIOLATION OF HUMAN DIGNITY

One of the foremost of Christian prin ciples is the concern for human dignity - respect for the individual personality ar

or the sanctity of our brotherhood with ll men, regardless of class, caste, or reed. Despite claims to the contrary, nany union leaders and members have nown *a marked disregard for either human ignity in general, individuals in particular, or ne spiritual bonds which alone can hold men in rotherhood with one another.* This is evi-ent not only in the use of compulsion in ecuring union membership, and in the se of both abusive language and violence gainst individuals who for good reason o not conform to the union pattern in mes of strike; it is evident also in such idespread practices as "feather-bedding," igid seniority systems, the rejection of centive programs, and the fomenting of lass warfare. It is an affront to human ignity to require that a man work at nly a fraction of his capacity, to reward im according to his standing on the sen-rity scale irrespective of his ability, nd to deny him the opportunity for super-or earnings for superior work. Such ractices reduce the individual to the ole of a cog in a machine, in which indi-iduality and ability, hence the sense of ntegrity and of being in responsible and esponsive relationship to the total in-ustrial effort, are cut to a common, col-ective pattern. This has every resem-lance to socialistic levelism, and as such ust be brought to Christian judgment.

VI. ABANDONMENT OF MERIT

The foregoing leads to consideration of *e growing disregard for the relationships of re-ard to production.* Christian principle, at east as applied to the realm of mater-l concern, has usually recognized the ctor of merit in determining material eward. What is taken out of an economy ust bear some correlation with what is ontributed to the economy in the invest-ent of time, energy, creative ability, or oney, whether by an individual or a roup. The disregard of this correlation, owever difficult it may be to determine, one of the major contributing factors the disturbing wage-price spiral and ecurring unemployment. When organized bor, fortified by its coercive power, de-mands wages and benefits beyond its fair share as determined by the principles of a free market, it is trying to squeeze out of an economy more than it puts in, and thus invites economic, political and moral disaster.

Organized labor has often asserted (whether correctly or incorrectly is not the present concern) that the financial return to the owners of industry is out of proportion to their contribution to society. But union labor's answer in terms of forcibly expropriating the wealth is worse than a simple "Robin Hood" philosophy of "robbing the rich to feed the poor" (though bad enough on that score alone); it is also the surest device for drying up the very investment capital by which employment is created. Yet the pressure for higher wages often continues without regard for economic realities, and organized labor is in a position to wreck an industry that resists its demands, no matter how unrealistic, and, in the process, destroy also the livelihood of its own membership and of an entire community. This is not speculation; it has happened! The power of exploitation has passed into the hands of union leadership in such marked degree that a moral judgment is inescapable. "Thou shalt not steal" is still a viable moral principle, no matter how disguised or to whom applied.

VII. DISREGARD FOR THE COMMUNITY

This last observation brings to attention a further violation of morals closely related to it. Whereas once again the Christian principle has always been concern for the rights and liberties of all,

> "For anyone who is interested in where America is heading, and who wonders how he might be working ten or twenty years from now, it would be a good idea to keep an eye on Walter Reuther. Wherever we are going, like it or not, Walter Reuther is helping to push us there. As a matter of fact, if he isn't already, he just may be your boss some day."
>
> Robert Crichton, article in ARGOSY, February, 1958

the demands of many labor unions for wages, benefits, and prerogatives for themselves, to the *exclusion of concern for the remainder of the community*, must be brought under judgment. No one questions the desirability of high wages and other forms of economic security, but when a segment of society, aided by political privilege and monopolistic power, seeks such benefits for itself alone, a grave inequity is imposed by the very organization which claims that its primary purpose is economic justice. The inflationary demands of organized labor which work hardship upon those -- especially the elderly and retired -- who have little or no means of increasing income must also be subjected to moral judgment. A further lack of concern for the community at large must be observed in times of many strikes, especially of the noneconomic and often "wildcat" variety, for which economic benefit is not even anticipated. These nevertheless paralyze, or at least impair, the production of wealth for both the local community and those parts of the economy elsewhere which are dependent upon the struck industry. It must be recognized that such strikes are not merely against employers but often, in effect, have the character of class warfare against the entire community. Another practice by which the innocent are made to suffer is the secondary boycott.

VIII. THE COVETING OF CONTROL

Inasmuch as exploitation and coercive expropriation should always be under the moral condemnation of religious sensibilities, judgment must also be brought upon *the undisguised purpose of some union leaders to seize at least joint control, if not total control, of the means of production without the financial and managerial responsibility that accompanies control.* The similarity of this purpose to socialistic purposes is unmistakable; the belief of many union leaders in free enterprise extends only to letting someone else pay the bill in exchange for token ownership while unionized labor takes the profits. The only just ways for wage earners or their organizations to secure a share in the control of industry are to buy it, as do all other investors, or to earn it by merit and achievement. The purpose, to the degree in which it exists, of forcibly seizing a larger, if not total, share in the control of industry must come under judgment with all socialistic and communistic purposes, for they are so similar as to make any real difference more verbal than actual.

IX. DISTORTION OF TRUTH

Still another fundamental principle of Christian faith is integrity and scrupulous regard for truth. Truth may be distorted unwittingly and in ignorance, but the persistent and obviously deliberate betrayal of truth in their representations of economic realities, belligerent one-sidedness in labor-management disputes and political debates, together with quick resort to vilification of any who challenge or oppose them, must bring against the leadership forces in organized labor the serious charge of *bearing false witness*. The persistent evasions on the part of many union leaders in appealing to the Fifth Amendment during the Senate investigations of union racketeering are only a more obvious case in point. The methods by which many labor organizations have misrepresented economic doctrine, disguised their purposes, and sought to conceal or disavow vicious practices are less commonly recognized but far more serious falsifications. It is by these artful propaganda measures that leaders of organized labor have succeeded in deceiving the public in general and such specialized groups as the clergy in particular. Behind the deliberate deceit, wherever it appears, is the Machiavellian-Marxist philosophy, whether conscious or unconscious, that "the end justifies the means." For this cynical disregard of truth in pursuit of their ends the guilty must uncompromisingly be brought to moral judgment.

X. BETRAYAL OF STEWARDSHIP

Finally, as Christian principle, under the concept of stewardship, has always

aced high value upon integrity and re-
onsibility in handling the lives, liber-
es, and properties of others, so a con-
derable segment of union leadership
ust be brought to stern judgment for
trayal of its stewardship. While the cor-
ption exposed in organized labor has
me under virtually universal condem-
tion, and is represented as the first and
ten only item of moral concern by many
clesiastical leaders and bodies, it is
re placed last as the *consequence* of the
rger abuses in union polity, philosophy,
d practice outlined in the preceding
ne points. These other nine have been
rtually ignored up to the present by many
eligious, labor, and political leaders.
orruption, in other words, has been too
rrowly interpreted as graft or racket-
ering. Great coercive power, yoked to
responsibility, the denial of freedom,
d a false conception of justice and
uality, cannot help breeding the obvious
nd of corruption which has attracted
blic attention. But to condemn this
nd of corruption alone is to strike at
e symptom rather than the cause.

The Appeal Is To Conscience

We realize that the foregoing, sounding
e note of judgment, is a somewhat nega-
ve approach to the problems presented.
mplicit in every negative, however, is the
ositive, as judgment must always precede
edemption. We feel that the prophetic
umpet of judgment must be sounded to
ouse the moral and spiritual forces of
merica from the peculiar and often dog-
atic slumber that exists in regard to
rganized labor. We present these judg-

> "Hoodlums and other unsavory elements still ride high in close to one fifth of the American labor movement. . . . The hoodlums are still feeding at the same troughs. Evidently they are above the law, above the power of all authority that might uproot them. And they have soured the reputation of the entire labor movement."
>
> NEWSWEEK, May 12, 1958

ments, not from any prejudices against labor, but simply because we are *for* the dignity, prosperity, and freedom of all workingmen, regardless of economic status. We are concerned that the very *organizations* of labor which once seemed to men of good will to be the laborer's friend and hope can become his enemy and prison. We believe that the workers' right to organize and bargain collectively (as well as to bargain individually if they so desire) must be fully recognized and preserved, but not under the conditions of coercive, monopoly power that exist in many parts of organized labor today.

We repeat that some of the evils detailed above may require legal correction, while others are probably not amenable to political action. Our purpose, however, is not political but educational on the level of religion and morals. Our appeal is to conscience. Only an informed and roused conscience can effectively move to correct the excesses and abuses which threaten not only the individual workman but also our entire way of life as a free nation.

> "More and more, the answers to labor's problems are political. . . . I do not want our movement to be the tail of any party's political kite. I want it to be able to influence the political behavior of our parties. Our job will take us into the community agencies, into local and state politics, into social planning, into the bloodstream of American life."
>
> James B. Carey, President, International Union of Electrical Workers, speech at Rutgers University, August 3, 1956.

Reprints of this article, together with or separate from the article, "Only the Unjust," will be made available if there is sufficient demand at the rate of 50¢ for ten, $4.00 per hundred, or $30.00 per thousand, delivered.

ONLY THE UNJUST LIVE BY FORCE

EDWARD W. GREENFIELD

In the following article, the first of a series pursuant of the moral criteria for evaluating organized labor, the new editor proceeds from the personal experience which he narrated in the May, 1957, issue of FAITH AND FREEDOM. Providing new information about the much-publicized strike of 1956-57 in Princeton, Indiana, he proceeds with other evidence to an appraisal of labor coercion and violence.

I watched a Midwestern town live, or try to live, for four months in the paralysis of fear. I do not mean that people cowered and cried as they might at the point of a gun, though there was even some of that. As instance, I'll never forget the night that a man called, pleading that I summon the police for his protection. He had sent his wife and children away, while he sat in his darkened house with a rifle, watching suspicious cars cruise back and forth on the road. Nor will I forget the day that another man came, saying that he had to quit the struggle we were engaged in because his life had been threatened and his wife was in hysterics. These, of course, were men in the thick of the battle. They were what the union indelicately called "scabs" who dared to go back to work in the teeth of a wildcat strike.

The Reign of Fear

But I am not referring just to these who had it worst. Their story has been widely distributed under the titles, "The Anatomy of a Wildcat," "Dear Mom," and "The Moral Imperative of the Right to Work." I'm talking about the community as a whole....

About the night, for example, that I sat with a group of worried business men. They asked me to call off the resistance movement of the workers in the struck industry -- the industry that was the economic backbone of the town -- because their business establishments were being hurt. They were not saying that the resistance was morally wrong. They agreed that morally we were right; but what we were doing was futile. You can't fight the power of a union. Better to surrender and have peace again.

Or the night that several members of my church met at the invitation of three young men who were *not* afraid. I wasn't there; I was told of it afterward. The three young men asked the group to approve a statement assuring me of the moral support of my own congregation and telling the town where they stood. The group approved -- but they would not sign their names!

For they remembered what had happened to the business of one of their number. A member of a local union not related to the strike at all had placed a large order for equipment to use on the farm he operated as a side line. He was told by fellow members of his union to cancel the order, or else expect trouble. Why? The head of the equipment firm was one of the handful of business men who had presumed to send telegrams to the International Headquarters of the striking union, condemning the strike as illegal and unwarranted, and urging that it be stopped.

The Terror Hidden

No, the terror did not always show where you could see it. Walking the

reets by day, despite the terrorism that alked by night, a casual visitor would elieve, if he did not overhear huddled nversations, that things were normal Princeton. Stores were still open, ffices still operating, banks still doing siness. He would not see the corner ocery store going broke giving credit strikers and fearing to do otherwise. e would not see the difference between e bank being boycotted and the bank that ld the union funds. He would not detect e studied indifference of the school- acher whose pupils represented the two ctions in his classroom, or of the ap- iance shop whose customers were both r and against.

One had to live there to feel the under- rrents and know what they meant. ere is no better mask for fear than urtesy and cultivated neutrality.

And yet, out of a town of ten thousand d a work force of six hundred and fifty the union directly involved, the strik- g faction was never more than a hundred! was no more than a hundred who nearly ined an industry, kept four hundred fel- w workers unemployed, used terrorism ainst those who dared to defy the picket e, and rendered the whole community potent to fight back or even to voice opinion!

At the time of the greatest fear, after e infant daughter of a young couple who fied the picket line had been shot rough the head, I took occasion to say om my pulpit in a radio sermon: "Be- use of the one per cent of the people, nety-nine per cent are being immobil- ed by fear, huddled like so many sheep iting to be sheared!... Think of it -- iny minority keeping the vast majority rrorized! That is how the dictators ce over, not by converting people to eir way of thinking, but by keeping them wed. There is nothing in America so ngerous as a lot of good people who, en the good is challenged by an evil, tight and do nothing, thinking only of eir own skins!"

thing Unique

The story of Princeton, Indiana, which s been told so many times in so many ways, could be multiplied by every violent strike that has ever occurred in any town in any corner of America. The Princeton story became national headline news only because a baby was shot. If the reign of fear in this community were isolated or unique, we could perhaps shrug it off as "one of those things that sometimes happens."

But it is not unique! It is only a single case in the first and most fundamental of the criteria by which organized labor must be brought to moral judgment: *it's resort to coercion and violence.*

> "It would require several volumes to recount the stories of strike violence of even recent years."
>
> Donald Richberg

I wish I could stop there. Violence, because it is overt, is obvious, and of course we don't like it. But the irony of the problem of organized labor is that, during a strike, violence is largely condoned. When the shooting of a baby in the Princeton battle roused an uncommon wave of emotional reaction, the International President of the Princeton Local issued the statement that his union "does *not* condone violence." Donald Richberg makes the point that "unions always claim that they do not 'condone' violence." Yet in the strike about which I can speak from personal familiarity, it had been going on for three months, including the shot-gunning of two other homes and the dynamiting of a third, before the public recoil at violence to a baby evoked the disclaimer by the International President.

A Double Standard

An editorial from the Indianapolis *Star* under the searing title "Whose Fault is Murder?" commented upon the crime and made the point that I am concerned to emphasize here. "There has been too much inclination in Indiana and elsewhere to regard vandalism, physical violence, and even gunplay as one thing when practiced in connection with a labor dispute, and another kind of crime entirely when no labor union is involved. There is no morality in the distinction. A baby's life, or an adult's, is as precious when a

strike is under way as it is when a burglar enters the house....The strikers at the plant are entitled to the law's protection, but so are those who refuse to strike. When the law becomes a one-way street to be traveled only by a select minority, that street leads to anarchy. And to murder!

"The lethargy that all too often grips peace officers called upon to investigate bombings, destruction of property, and gunfire in the night when a labor union is involved is as criminal as the acts themselves! Too many chiefs of police stay home when the labor goons are on the prowl. Too many solid citizens plead that it is none of their business. Too many politicians look the other way...."

The disturbing reality is that, under the political privilege and moral sanctions which organized labor has so long enjoyed, there is a "double standard" in regard to labor violence. It is somehow taken for granted that in labor disputes violence will occur and must be accepted, and therefore condoned, as it is accepted, condoned, and even glorified in military warfare.

It is the "second standard" of regarding strikes as a form of warfare, with most of the immunities and special dispensations of war, that gives to organized labor its particular and effective coercive power. If, as in war, "everything is fair" in the course of a strike just to make sure that the strike is won, all pretense at defending organized labor in terms of the right to organize for the purpose of collective *bargaining* must be abandoned. The acceptance of violence in a labor dispute as something other than a crime, no matter how often such violence is publicly disavowed by labor leaders or deplored by the lip service of public officials responsible for enforcing the laws against crime, has the clear implication that collective "bargaining" has become collective coercion!

Is Any Strike "Peaceful"?

This judgment is not changed when it is acknowledged that many strikes are "peaceful." It must be recognized that a strike, by its very nature, is always coercive, whether violent or not. It is c
ercive on two fronts: against the emplo
er, and against the people who want
work in spite of the strike. Even wh
"peaceful," a strike is always implici
and potentially violent, carrying with
the threat of a less scrupulous use of for
if "peaceful" means prove ineffecti
This implicit violence must be as fu
recognized, and as fully condemned,
the overt and explicit.

In his *Labor Union Monopoly*, (1) the pov
erful indictment of present-day organiz
labor by a long-time friend and champi
of labor, Donald Richberg makes th
point emphatic and unmistakable. "It
highly questionable whether any long stri
could be won by labor without the use
lawless methods of preventing a replac
ment of strikers or a steady drift
strikers back to work. Nowadays there
sure to be so much reasonableness in
large employer's efforts to prevent
strike, so much unreason in the ultima
labor demands, and so much individu
hardship in striking, that a long stri
would seldom be won if employees a
would-be employees could peacefully a
cept offers of employment.

"That is why the foul shape of terro
ism is always lurking in the shadows b
hind even apparently peaceful strikes.
any real effort is made by an employer
operate, and by willing workers to wo
despite a strike ban, then suddenly cru
violence appears in support of the strik
Such violence is always hypocritica
disavowed by strike leaders; but dyn
miting, stench bombing, train-wreckin
cable-cutting, window-smashing, and ph
sical assaults and intimidation of wou
be workers and their families do
happen by coincidence as spontaneo
outbursts of individual action."

Hidden Assumptions in "Right to Strike"

The defense of organized labor is of
made that, nevertheless, labor must ha
the "right to strike," or else its barga
ing with employers lacks power for "pe
suasion." The claim is made that if lab
is not permitted to fortify its dema

(1) op. cit., p. 94

coercive force, it is completely at mercy of the employers.

I. EMPLOYERS ARE EVIL

The point has its merit, but it contains umptions which need to be examined. ssumes, first of all, that employers as roup, with only a few exceptions, are spring and greedy, and unresponsive ept in the face of coercion. When it ves the purposes of labor leaders in tivating the organization of a union or calling of a strike, the employer is ost invariably represented in union paganda as the natural enemy of the oring man -- the pitting of class inst class. There are, unfortunately, ugh employers of this stripe to give ae substance to the claim.

But what is overlooked is that if an oloyer *should* be an approximation of caricature which the propaganda of ss struggle has so long made its ck-in-trade, no one is required to lk for him. In the competitive mar- any employer who becomes unrea- able to work for will lose his employ- to more attractive employment be unable to stay in business. The y "greed" of an employer by which ons so frequently seek to justify their anization is the best guarantee that workingman has of wages and condi- s of work which will keep him a will- workman. The vast majority of em- yers have learned, often the hard way, self-interest itself requires the ut- st in fair dealing with employees as l as stockholders and consumers. The rcive use of the strike weapon on the umption that most employers are im- vious to the legitimate interests of or is in reality increasingly difficult lefend.

II. UNIONS ARE THE BENEFACTOR

A second assumption that needs to be mined is that organized labor is re- nsible for the vast increase in the oring man's income and other per- sites. If it were not for the power of strike weapon in the hands of the un- s, it is claimed, the worker's scale of ng would be woefully depressed. This piece of fiction has been so long and widely accepted that a future issue of *Faith and Freedom* will have to be devoted to it in greater detail. Perhaps the most authoritative answer to this illusion is F. A. Harper's searching analysis, *Why Wages Rise*.(2) But the sum of the answer seems to be that the real source of higher wages and benefits is profits, and profits depend upon production. It is the increase of production per man-hour, due not to unions as such but to efficient, mass-producing machinery, labor-saving devices, and mass media of selling, these in turn making it profitable for employers to invest in still greater production facilities and creating still higher employment and wage scales, that have been the primary factors in the improvement of the laborer's standard of living.

Whatever the rank and file workman may owe to the union organizer, he owes far more to the inventor, the engineer, the salesman, the management, and the investing ownership of business and industry. In many respects the labor leader who organizes a union is a parasite upon the productive capacity of both American capital *and* labor, who, working together, have produced a plum for the labor leader's plucking. When members of a union are induced to strike, they are often, therefore, using coercion to extort from the productive process more than they themselves have put in. To extort this "more" is to increase the cost of production, and therefore of commodities, to a degree that cancels out most if not all of the gain, not to speak of the cost in lost wages to the strikers themselves.

III. NO ONE MAY WORK

But there is a third assumption in the so-called "right to strike" that needs to be examined -- this one on purely moral grounds. Few people, other than outright Communists, question the right of workers, individually or collectively,

(2) Harper, F.A., WHY WAGES RISE, The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, New York, 1957.

to quit their jobs if they do not like the wages or conditions of their work. *But their right forcibly to prevent others who are satisfied and willing to work from continuing their employment, or new workers from taking their places, must emphatically be called into question.*

The fact that strikers want to retain their jobs while nevertheless refusing to work is tacit admission that they are not so dissatisfied that they are ready to seek employment elsewhere. The very terms of the average strike are in themselves a form of backhanded tribute to the employers; and the desire for "more" is a witness to the fact that if greed is to be considered a factor, it is not a vice of employers alone.

But to compel those who either need or want to stay at their jobs to discontinue work along with those who want to strike, is to be guilty of the most glaring of immoralities. To adapt an analogy used by Professor Edward Chamberlin of Harvard, (3) if one of two maids working in a private home is dissatisfied with her employer or her wages, she will usually quit, and the mistress of the house proceeds to find a new maid, or at least to try to get along with the other one alone. But if, in quitting, the first maid contends that the mistress is not permitted to k the other maid working or to hire a n one, and that, if she tries, both the m tress and the other maids are subj to violence, the injustice involved is i mediately apparent.

Yet this is precisely what happens a larger scale when the dissatisfied wo ers in a struck industry threaten fo to make sure that no one is permitted work or to take over the strikers' jo Anyone who tries to go to work is cal a "scab" or a "strikebreaker," and evidence from the vast majority of strik in recent years is that it is the "scab their own fellow workers and union me bers, who suffer most of the abuse, timidation, and violence attendant u strikes. And this in the organization t professes to promote "brotherhood"!

The verdict seems inescapable. the light of the Christian principle of p suasion by love, reason, and examp the almost constant resort of organi labor to coercion and hidden or ov violence must be brought under the m uncompromising of moral judgments. dignify collective coercion by calling "collective bargaining" is to vitiate only the whole spirit of Christianity the dignity of labor as well. If coerc and violence are to continue as the te niques for pressing the demands of lab only moral blindness can give it sanctions of religion. Only the unj live by force.

(3) Chamberlin, Edward H., "The Monopoly Power of Labor," in David McCord Wright (ed.) THE IMPACT OF THE LABOR UNION, p. 184, Kelley & Millman, Inc., New York, 1956.

"The grim fact is that in recent years there has grown up among us a new form of slavery -- insidious, semisecret, and sinister. Today's captives are those rank-and-file union members who have fallen in helpless thrall to crooks and gangsters disguised under the title of 'labor leaders' or 'employer representatives.'.... I estimate that those now in bondage must number more than 1,000,000. Some put the figure as high as 4,000,000 -- which happens to approximate the number of American slaves in 1860."

Senator McClellan, SATURDAY EVENING POST article, May 3, 1958

"We are warning you (labor leaders) now, and we are warning all in the future: DO NOT DIFFER WITH THE MOVEMENT WITH RESPECT TO ISSUES OR CANDIDATES. WE WILL NOT STAND FOR IT."

Mr. James L. McDevitt, Co-director of COPE (Committee on Political Education of A.F.L.-C.I.O.), July, 1956.

CONFESSION OF CONCERN

BY THE EDITOR

It would be presumptuous to speak obiographically for any purposes of ity. Except to draw from experiences illustrate the issues with which we in ritual Mobilization seek to deal, I had eferred to keep myself in the back- ound. Yet the disposition and condition- of an editor, however objective he es to be, must color what he writes d publishes; and because readers have right to know the biases and idiosyn- asies of the man who asks their indul- nce, I have been urged to provide, not story of my life," but a summary of intellectual and spiritual pilgrimage. There is no need to contour the valleys d heights, or map the rough and smooth ads, which characterize the landscape any man's career. Let it be sufficient say that I have learned what I have rned by both bad decisions and good isions, by both folly and fortune, by trial and error through which a man en learns the hard way as well as by grace of God.

My boyhood years, beginning forty- e years ago, were spent in the forests d wide-open spaces outside Seattle, shington, under primitive conditions mparable to those of the nineteenth ntury pioneers. My parents, as new- mers from Sweden, were of that sturdy, vout, and self-sufficient stock which ovided the character and strength of e earlier eras in American history. om them I learned to be an "inner- rected" individualist who seldom felt d was only occasionally exposed to the nformist pressures which have become idemic among the generation of my own ildren.

n Individualistic Socialist

Ironically, it was as an individualist at, in college, I became a near-socialist. tering the State university in 1932, hav- to room and board (believe it or not) on less than $4.00 a week, with tuition only $25.00 a quarter, I was drawn into the minority group of rebels who just before the dawn of the Roosevelt Era were still unpopular. That crucial first year created the internal revolution that switched me from an uninformed fundamentalism to an equally uninformed "modernism" and social "liberalism" to which a number of young idealists were converted during those years of the "fundamentalist-modernist" controversy and the depths of the Great Depression. Upon transferring to another college, I continued on the religious and political "left," encountering little to challenge it and much to encourage it. As "liberalism" became increasingly the accepted pattern, I stayed with it throughout theological seminary, where I was steeped in the Social Gospel in its time of greatest political, intellectual, and ecclesiastical ascendancy.

It is familiarly, though not too accurately, said that "if you are not a socialist at twenty, you have no heart; but if you're a socialist at thirty, you have no money; and if a socialist at forty, you have no brains." In my mid-thirties, after ten years of preaching, teaching, and desultory foundering, I had no money, and had reached the dead end in my career as steered by my so-called "brains." But it was precisely at this dead end that I did some serious revaluating of the pattern of my life and the content of my thinking. It was at this point that I rediscovered the meaning of myself as an individual, and of God as the source of guidance and grace. Under the inspiration of a book, which enormously illumined the full implications of the social thinking to which I had been so long addicted, I came to reaffirm my boyhood heritage of individuality and independence, subject only to God, and started remaking my career. As a first step, after an absence of six years, spent

mostly in graduate study and college teaching, I returned to the Christian ministry.

The Liberal Religious Vision

As a minister now, nearly ten years later, I continue to be theologically "liberal," though deepened and chastened, I trust, by experience, greater maturity, and more searching understanding. Perhaps, because labels have become so ambiguous, I could designate my religious position with equal ambiguity as "middle-of-the-road." For research, thought, and experience have led to recovery from the conservatism of my boyhood such verities as prayer, belief in fundamental principles, and submission to the Divine Will, together with a growing comprehension of the teaching and meaning of Christ.

I have learned that, refined, modified, and adapted to one's own central vision, truth and insight are to be found in all traditions, and that none is to be despised simply because at other points we differ. I no longer quarrel with those who sincerely and intelligently hold to religious convictions different from my own. As much as the pages of *Faith and Freedom* may engage in controversial matters on the social front, these pages will never be used for gratuitous theological dispute. Spiritual Mobilization seeks to build its social constructs upon moral and spiritual insights derived from prophetic elements in the Judeo-Christian tradition common to both liberal *and* conservative.

And yet, let it be emphasized that theologically, at least as distinguished from neo-orthodoxy and fundamentalism, I am still essentially a liberal. I want this to be clear, for it is the theological liberals, for a long time I among them, who for the most part have been disposed toward the "liberalism" that is too often an honorific label put upon varying degrees and brands of socialism.

The Conservative Social Vision

For me, that kind of "liberalism" is past. On the social front I have become progressively more conservative, not because I have more money (because I haven't), but because, I hope, I do have a little more "brains" and considerably more "religion." And yet, while the acquisition of a more conservative social outlook is fairly normal with what is called "the mellowing of the years," I plead two special exceptions.

The first is that the conservative social point of view, which for want of a better word has been somewhat clumsily called "libertarianism," springs for me from my liberal theological orientation. It has become my firm conviction that liberal religious thinking, to be consistent, must lead into a philosophy of political, economic, and social freedom as the only valid foundation for justice. There is an emphasis here that needs to be made. There are numerous religious *conservatives* who hold to conservative social views, and I am grateful for their perspective. It needs to be shown, however, that a religious *liberal*, also, can be and ought to be socially conservative.

I happen to like the word "liberal." I like it because it was originally associated with the prophetic spirit of rebellion against the rigidities of orthodoxy in whatever areas of concern the rigidities are found. The prophet has always challenged the *status quo*. He seeks to inject flexibility into, and, if the resistance is too unyielding, he does not hesitate from the heights of eternal principle to brin thundering judgment upon, the pattern and molds by which a current civilizatio is being strait-jacketed and strangle His primary passions are freedom an justice -- freedom that does justice n simply to the life of the flesh but espe cially to the mind and spirit -- as again the imprisoning ideologies, legalism and systems which, though often designe originally to liberate men, have harden into chains for lack of continuing visio "The spirit of the Lord is upon me," d clared Jesus, recalling Isaiah,

> "Because He has anointed me to preach
> good news to the poor.
> He has sent me to proclaim release
> to the captives,
> And recovering of sight to the blind;

o set at liberty those who are
pressed...." (1)

is the authentic voice of the proph-
rebel, the true meaning of religious
alism -- and social conservatism!

New "Underdog"

his is why I have become a libertar-
meaning "to set at liberty," and this
s me to the second exception. The
se of my social thinking has not been
amiliar retreat into the "mellowness"
cepting a *status quo* because of pros-
y, a desire to relax from younger
es, or a failure of nerve. In the mid-
ears, I could settle back complacent-
th a reasonably acceptable achieve-
. Instead, I have become a libertar-
ith somewhat the same psychologi-
motivation that I had twenty-five
s ago as a near-socialist. The same
netic idealism which made me a
pion of the "underdog" then keeps me
mpion of the "underdog" now.

xcept that the meaning of "underdog"
o be redefined! No one becomes so
an "underdog" as anyone subjected
egimentation by organized power,
ier in the hands of government,
, or industry. The true "underdog"
nyone who is less than a free man.
is sake I was in my earlier years,
different and mistaken auspices, a
der. After some barren years, I
recovered "the divine discontent"
Robert Lindner has called "the in-
t of rebellion." I continue to be un-
ingly an individualistic though re-
sible rebel -- a rebel with a cause!

Stimulus of Battle

uch of the impetus for my present
rn came from the shock of the battle
ich I engaged a year and a half ago
e unofficial leader of a valiant band
ion members who dared to stand
st the irresponsibility, vilification,
violence of their own union. The
of that battle has been told in a
er issue of *Faith and Freedom*. In
rovidence of God -- and I know of no other way to explain it -- I have now become editor of that same journal. Here, on these pages, I hope to express the liberal religious spirit matured into a libertarian social philosophy. The frightful experience of the Princeton strike provided the impetus and opened the doors.

I must insist, however, that it has not determined my social thinking or made me "lopsided," except as anyone belonging to a prophetic minority must be "lopsided." What the strike did was compel me to apply to another area of concern the very principles which made me see that there, in my own community, was a battle that had to be entered if I was to be true to those principles. And once the battle had been fought, I could no longer sit comfortably by and let this kind of thing, and the whole context of irresponsible social thinking of which it was a specific instance, go on without challenge. In all conscience and Christian conviction I had to become a "rebel with a cause."

The Christian Libertarian

And so, I claim the libertarian outlook -- if you wish, the "conservative-liberal" outlook -- as the vanguard of the prophetic movement of our era. It is "conservative" in its belief that eternal principles, proclaimed long ago by our Christian faith, must guide the course of free institutions and governments if these are to endure. Yet it is "liberal," too, in the sense of looking beyond the present to a freer, finer way of life in which the conserving principles are applied to the liberation of men from their present and hardening chains.

But because the words "conservative" and "liberal" have come to be so seriously misunderstood and ambiguously applied, I am happy to adopt the name of "Christian libertarian," clumsy as it may be, as the symbol of the prophetic spirit of freedom so desperately needed now. For me it is the contemporary meaning of restoring sight to the blind, and setting at liberty those who are oppressed.

Luke 4:18 (R.S.V.)

$500 IN AWARDS

For Sermons on the Labor Question

Spiritual Mobilization, believing in the vital importance of Labor Day, and desiring to benefit from the moral and spiritual insights of clergymen on the labor question, offers awards totaling $ 500 for sermons or addresses delivered by clergymen of any faith at any time between August 30 and September 30, 1958. This wider spread of time recognizes that the concerns of Labor Day need not be confined to a calendar date.

Two awards of $100 each and six of $ 50 each will be given for addresses before any public gathering on the general theme of "Moral Standards and Labor Today."

A moral critique of organized labor is submitted in this Labor Day issue of *Faith and Freedom*. The awards are not offered for a parroting of this critique, but for the most constructive use of it. One award of $ 100, and six of $ 50, are for these sermons. The second award of $ 100 is for the address which most intelligently and effectively challenges our moral critique without violating the spirit of the theme, "Faith for Our Freedom," which appears inside the front cover.

Any clergyman wishing to take part should submit his manuscript in typewritten, mimeographed, or printed form, showing place and date of delivery. Entries may be submitted in behalf of the minister by interested laymen. Manuscripts should be mailed to Spiritual Mobilization, P.O. Box 877, San Jacinto, California, on or before October 20, 1958.

Entries will be evaluated by competent judges selected by Spiritual Mobilization. Awards will be made on the basis of clarity, comprehension of the subject, and the fairness and Christian spirit of the presentation. Spiritual Mobilization reserves the right to publish in whole or in part any prize-winning entry. All other manuscripts will be returned upon request if postage is provided.

CAMPBELL HOUSE, National Headquarters of SPIRITUAL MOBILIZATION

SAN JACINTO, CALIFORNIA

Rev. Oscar Burdick
% Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

PAID
San Jacinto, California
Permit No. 12